

Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning Committee** held at the **Shire Hall** on **Wednesday 28th October 2026** at **5pm**

Councillors:

Present: Cllrs. David Adelson, Ruth Leach, Simon Sadler, Robin Sanders and Katharine Turner.

Apologies: Cllrs. Sue Bale, Nigel Phipps and Eamonn O’Nolan.

In attendance: Town Clerk (Mr G E Diaper) and no members of the public.

1. Apologies for Absence.

The Committee agreed to approve the apologies of Cllrs. Sue Bale, Nigel Phipps and Eamonn O’Nolan.

2. To receive Declarations of Interest.

No members made any declarations of interests in relation to items on the agenda.

3. Requests for Dispensations.

There were no requests for a dispensation in relation to items on the agenda.

4. Public Question Time.

There were no members of the public present.

5. To agree and approve the minutes of the meeting held 30th September 2026.

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held 30th September 2026 were approved as a true record.

6. To note intentions to undertake works to trees in the conservation area (TCA).

The Committee noted the following intentions to undertake works to trees in the Woodbridge Conservation Area:

DC/26/3411/TCA – 7 Queens Head Lane Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4ND

DC/26/3460/TCA – 3 Doric Place Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 1BT

DC/26/3601/TCA – Quaker Burial Ground Turn Lane Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4AR

DC/26/3623/TCA – 4 Doric Place Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 1BT

DC/26/3652/TCA – 22 Cumberland Street Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4AB

DC/26/3719/TCA – 8 Pytches Road Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 1ET – The Committee were disappointed to note that an Ash tree (T9) was proposed for removal though there was no mention of disease or other problems. A healthy Ash is very valuable, owing to widespread Ash die-back.

7. To comment on applications to trees with a Tree Preservation Order (TPO).

There were no TPO applications to consider at this meeting.

8. To comment on applications for planning permission.

The Committee commented on the following applications:

Application	Comment
DC/26/3320/LBC – The Chapel Seckford Almshouses Seckford Street Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4NB	No objection.
DC/26/3227/VOC – Whisstocks Boatyard Tide Mill Way Woodbridge Suffolk	<p>WTC recommend refusal of the application on the following grounds:</p> <p>1 – The application is lacking in any detail – the application form provides no information about the applicant, property or even reference to the existing planning permission which is sought to be varied – this information is only provided in the application ‘title’. We are staggered that such an application has passed the validations requirements.</p> <p>2 – We support the position of the Environmental Protection Officer that the requirement to remove the tables and chairs after 10pm is to prevent use outside of the times permitted, and any associated anti-social behaviour which may arise from late night use of the seating area.</p> <p>3 – WTC is deeply concerned about access across its property at Whisstocks Place for</p>

	<p>emergency vehicles – a recent fire on a houseboat adjacent to Whisstocks Place had to be fought from Ferry Quay, rather than Whisstocks Place, as Suffolk Fire and Rescue chose not to cross Whisstocks Place due to known obstructions of tables and chairs.</p> <p>4 – The application is misleading in that the map provided references an area ‘Rented from the Town Council’. We do not dispute that WTC does rent space to the restaurant for tables and chairs (and is complicit in relation to point 3 at the current time) but would like to make it clear that this application only concerns the land adjacent to the Woodyard restaurant (as defined by metal studs in the ground), and not the Town Council’s area of ownership. The area within the metal studs directly outside the restaurant is covered by Condition No. 6 of DC/21/2717/VOC; the Town Council’s area of ownership is not and therefore not party to this application. The Section 106 agreement which covers the public open space is the governing document for the Council’s area of ownership.</p> <p>Furthermore, WTC are concerned that the neighbouring properties have not been advised about this application and request the Planning Authority seek neighbour comment before determining the application.</p>
<p>DC/26/3285/FUL – 1 Beaconsfield Road Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 1EQ</p>	<p>WTC disagree with the ESC Heritage Officer as the size of the proposed dormer (being the full width of the available roof space) will be clearly visible from public area/ street and therefore detract significantly from the heritage of the Beaconsfield Road street scene. We therefore recommend refusal of the application as the proposals are in contravention of the following policies of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan:</p>

SCLP5.7: Infill and Garden Development

Proposals for infill development or residential development within existing gardens will be supported where:

- a) The scale, design and materials would not result in harm to the street scene or character of the area;

SCLP11.1: Design Quality

The Council will support locally distinctive and high quality design that clearly demonstrates an understanding of the key features of local character and seeks to enhance these features through innovative and creative means.

- c) Respond to local context and the form of surrounding buildings in relation to the following criteria:
 - iv. there should be a clear relationship between buildings and spaces and the wider street scene or townscape;

Policy SCLP11.5: Conservation Areas

Development within, or which has potential to affect the setting of, Conservation Areas will be assessed against the relevant Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans and any subsequent additions or alterations. Developments should be of a particularly high standard of design and high quality of materials in order to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area.

Proposals for development within a Conservation Area should:

- a) Demonstrate a clear understanding of the significance of the conservation area alongside an assessment of the potential impact of the proposal on that significance;

	<p>b) Preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area;</p> <p>c) Be of an appropriate design, scale, form, height, massing and position;</p>
DC/26/2902/FUL – 9 Angel Lane Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4NG	<p>Noting that this latest application is for a two-storey rear extension rather than the original single storey proposal, WTC retains the same concerns about this application as the previous application at this property (DC/24/2697/FUL) and therefore retains its recommendation of refusal as the application is in contravention of the following policies of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan:</p> <p>SCLP11.1: Design Quality:</p> <p>c.1) the overall scale and character should clearly demonstrate consideration of the component parts of the buildings and the development as a whole in relation to its surroundings.</p> <p>SCLP11.2: Residential Amenity</p> <p>h) Safety and security – for the risk of landslide into neighbouring property. e) The resulting physical relationship with other properties as the application will cause an unacceptable loss of amenity for existing or future occupiers of development in the vicinity.</p>
DC/26/3500/LBC – Marston House 6 Cumberland Street Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4AB	No objection
DC/26/1835/FUL – 3 Balliol Close Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4EQ	Whilst noting that the scale of the proposed extension to the front of the property has been reduced, WTC retain its recommendation of refusal of this application as we still consider that the

	<p>proposal contravenes the following policies of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan due to the significant visual harm to be caused by an extension at the front of the property:</p> <p>Policy SCLP5.7: Infill and Garden Development</p> <p>a) The scale, design and materials would not result in harm to the street scene or character of the area;</p> <p>b) The proposal is well related in scale and design to adjacent properties, including the design of curtilage areas, parking and access, and incorporates landscaping where appropriate to mitigate any potential impacts or to enhance the appearance of the site;</p> <p>Policy SCLP11.2: Residential Amenity</p> <p>b) Outlook;</p> <p>e) The resulting physical relationship with other properties;</p>
DC/26/3559/LBC – 138 Castle Street Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 1HL	No objection
DC/26/1673/FUL – 21 New Street Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 1DY	No further comments – our recommendation of refusal is retained.

9. To comment on application received since the publication of this agenda (deadline – midday on Tuesday 27th October).

No additional applications received.

10. To note the decisions taken by East Suffolk Council on planning applications considered by this Committee.

The Committee noted the decisions taken by East Suffolk Council on planning applications considered by this Committee.

11. To receive a verbal update from the Neighbourhood plan Working Party further to their meeting with Dickon Povey and subsequent internal meetings.

The Committee received an update from the Neighbourhood Plan Working Party following their meeting with Dickon Povey, the East Suffolk Council Officer with a responsibility for Neighbourhood Planning, and a subsequent meeting of that Working Party.

The Planning Committee agreed to recommend to Full Council:

- That Woodbridge Town Council does not seek to produce a neighbourhood plan for Woodbridge, and that no funds should be provided in the 2027/28 to pay for such an undertaking.
- That Woodbridge Town Council, further to a level of public engagement yet to be quantified, should agree a strategic position in relation of development proposals within the town.

12. Closure.

The meeting was closed at 6.17pm.

Councillor David Adelson
Chair